arXiv:1510.03878v1 [math.OC] 13 Oct 2015

Global Exponential Stabilization on $SO(3)$ via Hybrid Feedback

Soulaimane Berkane [a] Abdelkader Abdessameud [a] Abdelhamid Tayebi [a,b]

[a] *Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada, N6A 3K7.*

[b] *Department of Electrical Engineering, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, Ontario, Canada, P7B 5E1.*

Abstract

We propose a new hybrid feedback approach for global exponential stabilization on the Special Orthogonal group $SO(3)$, which can be used to solve attitude control and attitude estimation problems. Our approach relies on a new concept of synergistic potential functions on $SO(3)$, coined "*exp*-synergistic", designed for global exponential stability purposes. Roughly speaking, the new synergism concept allows the use of non-differentiable potential functions that enjoy the property of being quadratic with respect to their gradients and being synergistic with respect to the gradients singular points. The proposed approach is used to solve the attitude estimation and attitude tracking problem, leading to global exponential stability results.

Key words: Attitude control; Attitude estimation; Hybrid feedback; Exp-synergistic potential functions; Special orthogonal group.

1 Introduction

The attitude control problem of rigid body systems has received a growing interest during the last decade, with various applications in aerospace, marine engineering, and robotics (see, for instance, Hughes, 1986; Joshi et al., 1995; Tayebi and McGilvray, 2006; Sakagami et al., 2010; Kreutz and Wen, 1988, to name a few). Attitude control systems can be categorized by the choice of the attitude parameterization, such as Euler angles, unit quaternion, and modified Rodrigues parameters. All these parameterizations fail to represent the attitude of a rigid body both globally and uniquely, which results in control schemes that are either singular or exhibit the so-called unwinding phenomenon (Chaturvedi et al., 2011). On the other hand, some research work such as in Koditschek (1988); Mahony et al. (2008); Lee (2012), has been devoted to the attitude control and estimation design directly on Special Orthogonal group $SO(3)$, where the orientation of the rigid body is uniquely and globally represented by a rotation matrix in $SO(3)$. Indeed, the special orthogonal group $SO(3)$ has the distinct feature of being a boundaryless compact manifold with a Lie group structure that allows the design and analysis of attitude control systems within the well established framework of geometric control (Bullo, 2005). The group $SO(3)$ is not diffeomorphic to any Euclidean space and hence there does not exists any continuous time-invariant feedback on $SO(3)$ that achieves global asymptotic stability (Bhat and Bernstein, 2000). For instance, Koditschek (1988) presented a continuous time-invariant feedback to track any smooth reference attitude trajectory asymptotically from any initial condition except from a set of Lebesgue measure zero. This is referred to as *almost* global asymptotic stability (AGAS). Almost global tracking on general Lie groups, including $SO(3)$, has also been dealt with, for instance, in Maithripala et al. (2006). Nonlinear observer design on $SO(3)$ with almost global asymptotic stability results has been discussed in Mahony et al. (2008). The "almost-global" nature of the asymptotic stability is mainly due to the fact that these control systems are designed based on the gradient of smooth potential functions leading to the non-avoidable appearance of undesired critical points [1]. In fact, according to Morse theory (see (Morse, 1934)), any smooth potential function on $SO(3)$ is guaranteed to have at least four critical points where its gradient vanishes. Moreover, the exist-

⋆ This work was supported by the National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

Email addresses: sberkane@uwo.ca (Soulaimane Berkane), aabdess@uwo.ca (Abdelkader Abdessameud), atayebi@lakeheadu.ca (Abdelhamid Tayebi).

[1] A set of critical points of a real-valued differentiable function f on a given manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is understood as the set of all points in $\mathcal{M}$ such that the differential of f is zero in all tangent directions (Itô, 1993, Morse Theory 279 (VII.8)).

ing AGAS schemes suffer from slow convergence in the neighbourhood of the undesired equilibria as observed in (Lee, 2012). On the other hand, there have been some attempts to design attitude control systems with global stability results. In fact, one can achieve global exponential stability using a discontinuous quaternion-based control, as done in Thienel and Sanner (2003). However, these discontinuous attitude control systems suffer from non-robustness to arbitrary small measurement disturbances as explained in Mayhew and Teel (2011a). The recent work in Mayhew and Teel (2011b) focuses on the design of hybrid feedback systems that overcome the topological obstruction to global asymptotic stability on $SO(3)$ and, at the same time, ensure some robustness to measurement noise. The hybrid algorithm is based on a family of *smooth* potential functions and a hysteresis-based switching mechanism to avoid the undesired critical points. After each switching, the control law derived from the minimal potential function is selected. A sufficient condition for global asymptotic stability of the resulting hybrid controller is the "synergism" property. A family of potential functions on $SO(3)$ is synergistic if at each critical point (other than the desired one) of a potential function in the family, there exists another potential function in the family that has a lower value; in particular, if all the potential functions in the family share the identity rotation as a critical point then it is called a *centrally* synergistic family. Interestingly, the design of hybrid controllers on $SO(3)$, leading to robust and global asymptotic stability results, using this approach boils down to the search for a *suitable* synergistic family of potential functions.

1.1 A motivating example

To better explain the problems encountered in the design of global attitude control systems on $SO(3)$, it is interesting to notice that attitude control algorithms (on $SO(3)$) are generally designed using the modified-trace function

$$\Phi_A(R) = \frac{1}{2\gamma_A}\text{tr}(A(I-R)),\ A = A^T > 0,\ \gamma_A > 0,$$

in the Lyapunov-based design and analysis. For instance, if we consider the attitude kinematics $\dot{R} = R\Omega$, with the feedback $\Omega = -R^\top \nabla\Phi_A(R) = -(AR - R^\top A)/2\gamma_A$, then one can show that the closed loop system has four equilibria corresponding to the critical points of Φ_A where the gradient $\nabla\Phi_A(R) = 0$. The *undesired* critical points are identified by $\mathcal{R}_a(\pi, \mathcal{E}(A))$ which represents the set of all rotations of angle π and axis $v \in \mathcal{E}(A)$, with $\mathcal{E}(A)$ being the set of unit eigenvectors of A. It is also shown that the manifold $\mathcal{R}_a(\pi, \mathbb{S}^2)$ of all rotations of angle π is invariant under this feedback Mayhew and Teel (2011c).

To avoid the undesired critical points when using a control law derived from the smooth potential function Φ_A, one can adopt the approach in Mayhew and Teel (2011b) as follows. Consider the attitude kinematics with the hybrid control input $\Omega(R,q) = -R^T\nabla\mathcal{U}(R,q)$, where $\mathcal{U}(R,q) : SO(3)\times\mathcal{Q} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a family of potential functions for some index set $\mathcal{Q}$ and $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ is generated by the dynamic system

$$\begin{cases} \dot{q} = 0, & (R,q) \in C \\ q^+ \in g(R), & (R,q) \in D \end{cases}$$

where the flow set C and jump set D are given by

$$C = \{(R,q) : \mathcal{U}(R,q) - \min_{m\in\mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{U}(R,m) \le \delta\}$$
$$D = \{(R,q) : \mathcal{U}(R,q) - \min_{m\in\mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{U}(R,m) \ge \delta\},$$

and $g(R) = \{q \in \mathcal{Q} :\ \mathcal{U}(R,q) = \min_{m\in\mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{U}(R,m)\}$. Then, as shown in Mayhew (2010), the resulting closed loop system is globally asymptotically stable provided that the family of potential functions $\mathcal{U}(R,q)$ is synergistic with a hysteresis gap exceeding δ. A general approach for constructing such synergetic potential functions on $SO(3)$ has been presented in Mayhew and Teel (2011c) using the angular warping technique. Roughly speaking, this technique consists of introducing a transformation that allows to stretch/compress the manifold $SO(3)$ and move the undesired critical points to different locations. In Casau et al. (2014), this technique has been developed using a particular transformation that leads to centrally synergistic potential functions. However, the approach in Casau et al. (2014) did not allow for the computation of the hysteresis gap needed for implementation. This problem has been recently solved in Berkane and Tayebi (2015) where a different choice of transformation that enables the explicit determination of the synergistic gap has been considered. In Mayhew and Teel (2013a) and Lee (2015), a different approach has been adopted to construct *non-centrally* synergistic family of smooth potential functions from which globally stabilizing control laws can be designed. It is worth pointing out that non-central and central synergistic potential functions on the n-dimensional sphere have been constructed, for instance, in Mayhew and Teel (2013b) and Casau et al. (2015) to ensure global asymptotic and exponential stabilization, respectively. Despite their originality, these approaches are used in the *reduced* attitude control problem and the extension of the obtained results to the *full* attitude control problem on $SO(3)$ is not straightforward.

Moreover, we can show stronger exponential results using the smooth feedback $\Omega = -R^\top\nabla\Phi_A(R)$ discussed so far. In fact, using the following inequality

$$(1+\text{tr}(R))\underline{\alpha}\ \Phi_A(R) \le \|\nabla\Phi_A(R)\|_F^2,$$

for some constant $\underline{\alpha}$ (Lee, 2015; Berkane and Tayebi, 2015), one can show that $\Phi_A(R)$ exponentially converges to zero with a *state-dependent* rate of convergence equals to $(1+\text{tr}(R))\underline{\alpha}$. That is, the exponential convergence

degenerates in the neighbourhood of the undesired manifold $\mathrm{tr}(R) = -1$ causing slow convergence for large initial attitudes as observed in (Lee, 2012). One possible way to overcome this problem is to use a non-differentiable potential function on $SO(3)$ enjoying the property of having the gradient magnitude proportional to the attitude error. An example of such potential functions is the "square-root" potential function $V(R) = 2 - \sqrt{1 + \mathrm{tr}(R)}$ used in Lee (2012) for attitude tracking on $SO(3)$ or its unit quaternion equivalent used in Thienel and Sanner (2003). This function enjoys the property of being quadratic relative to its gradient; *i.e.,*

$$\frac{1}{4}V(R) \leq \|\nabla V(R)\|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}V(R),$$

which prevents a gradient-based control input to vanish except for the attitude $R = I$. However, the major drawback of using this function lies in the singularity of the resulting control input at an angular error of π.

1.2 Contributions of the paper

In the present paper, we propose solutions to the global exponential stabilization problem on $SO(3)$ using hybrid control schemes. Instrumental to the design of such hybrid control schemes, the "*exp*-synergistic" potential functions concept consisting of using non-differentiable functions enjoying the property of being quadratic with respect to their gradients and being synergistic with respect to the gradients' singular points. The contributions of the paper can be summarized as follows:

- The proposed hybrid attitude control algorithms on $SO(3)$ rely on a hysteresis-based switching mechanism that selects appropriate configurations of the controller defined from the gradient of generic non-differentiable potential functions. In contrast to Mayhew and Teel (2011b), the hysteresis-based switching mechanism avoids the *singular* manifold (instead of the critical points) where the gradient of each potential function is not defined. This allows us to take advantage of the exponential convergence rate, ensured by controllers derived from the non-differentiable potential functions, and global results can still be achieved. In fact, we prove that global exponential stability, with a constant convergence rate, is guaranteed under the sufficient condition that the family of potential functions on $SO(3)$ is *exp*-synergistic. Under the same condition, we further show that continuous attitude controllers can also be designed without sacrificing the global exponential stability results. More precisely, we modify the proposed hybrid control schemes using a simple dynamic system that places the switching one integrator away from the actual control input. This way, the hybrid dynamics are still employed to overcome the topological obstruction while the applied control input is continuous. It should be noted that the idea of smoothing hybrid controllers on $SO(3)$ has appeared in Mayhew and Teel (2013a), however, only global asymptotic stability is obtained using more complex dynamic systems.
- We show that a family of *exp*-synergistic potential functions can be effectively constructed, using angular warping technique, to explicitly derive the proposed attitude control algorithms. In fact, we propose a new transformation that ensures all the required properties from a specific family of non-differentiable potential functions and, in addition, allows us to explicitly compute a lower bound for the hysteresis gap needed in the design of the switching mechanism. As will become clear later, angular warping in our work is used to avoid a singular 3-dimensional manifold rather than a finite number of critical points as done in (Casau et al., 2014; Berkane and Tayebi, 2015). In contrast to Lee (2015), the proposed *exp*-synergistic potential function is *central* which guarantees that each control law, derived from each potential function in the family, ensures independently an almost global stability result. This is desirable in practice since the control objective remains achievable even when the hybrid switching mechanism runs into error. Moreover, the non-central synergistic family used in Lee (2015) do not enjoy the property of being quadratic relative to its gradient *independently* of the attitude error.
- Using the proposed approach, we present solutions to two problems commonly considered in the literature, namely the attitude estimation and attitude tracking problems. In both cases, global exponential stability results are guaranteed. In contrast to Lee (2015), our attitude tracking control scheme is continuous and global exponential stability is obtained with a constant exponential-decay rate. In fact, the global exponential stability results achieved with the proposed attitude observer and attitude tracking controller have, to the best of our knowledge, never been obtained in the literature. Moreover, motivated by practical implementation purposes, we show that all the proposed control and estimation schemes in this paper can be explicitly implemented in terms of an arbitrary number (greater than or equal to two) of inertial vector measurements obtained from sensors used in attitude control and estimation applications.

1.3 Notations

Throughout the paper, we use $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R}^+$ and $\mathbb{N}$ to denote, respectively, the sets of real, nonnegative real and natural numbers. We denote by $\mathbb{R}^n$ the n-dimensional Euclidean space and by $\mathbb{S}^n$ the unit n-sphere embedded in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Given $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, their Euclidean inner product is defined as $\langle x, y\rangle = x^\top y$ and the Euclidean norm of x is defined as $\|x\| = \sqrt{\langle x, x\rangle}$. For a square matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, we denote by $\lambda_i^A, \lambda_{\min}^A$, and $\lambda_{\max}^A$ the ith, minimum, and maximum eigenvalue of A, respectively. The 2-norm of A is $\|A\|_2 = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(A^\top A)}$. Given two matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, their Euclidean inner product is defined as $\langle\langle A, B\rangle\rangle = \mathrm{tr}(A^\top B)$ and the Frobenius norm

of A is $\|A\|_F = \sqrt{\langle\langle A, A\rangle\rangle}$. A function $f : X \to Y$ is a $\mathcal{C}^k$ function if all its first k derivatives exist and are continuous, in which case we write $f \in \mathcal{C}^k(X, Y)$.

2 Preliminaries and Problem Formulation

2.1 Attitude representation

The orientation (or attitude) of a rigid body is represented by a *rotation matrix* R belonging to the special orthogonal group $SO(3) := \{R \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3} | \ \det(R) = 1, \ RR^\top = I\}$, where I is the three-dimensional identity matrix. The group $SO(3)$ has a compact manifold structure with its tangent spaces being identified by $T_R SO(3) := \{R\Omega \mid \Omega \in \mathfrak{so}(3)\}$. The *Lie algebra* of $SO(3)$, denoted by $\mathfrak{so}(3) := \left\{\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times3} \mid \ \Omega^\top = -\Omega\right\}$, is the vector space of 3-by-3 skew-symmetric matrices. The inner product on $\mathbb{R}^{3\times3}$, when restricted to the Lie-algebra of $SO(3)$, defines the following *left-invariant* Riemannian metric on $SO(3)$

$$\langle R\Omega_1, R\Omega_2\rangle_R := \langle\langle \Omega_1, \Omega_2\rangle\rangle, \tag{1}$$

for all $R \in SO(3)$ and $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$. The map $[\cdot]_\times : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathfrak{so}(3)$ is defined such that $[x]_\times y = x \times y$, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$, where $\times$ denotes the vector cross-product on $\mathbb{R}^3$. Also, let $\text{vex} : \mathfrak{so}(3) \to \mathbb{R}^3$ denote the inverse isomorphism of the map $[\cdot]_\times$, such that $\text{vex}([\omega]_\times) = \omega$, for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $[\text{vex}(\Omega)]_\times = \Omega$, for all $\Omega \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$. Defining $\mathbb{P}_a : \mathbb{R}^{3\times3} \to \mathfrak{so}(3)$ as the projection map on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ such that $\mathbb{P}_a(A) := (A - A^\top)/2$, one can extend the definition of vex to $\mathbb{R}^{3\times3}$ by taking the composition map $\psi := \text{vex} \circ \mathbb{P}_a$ such that, for a 3-by-3 matrix $A := [a_{ij}]_{i,j=1,2,3}$, one has

$$\psi(A) := \text{vex}\left(\mathbb{P}_a(A)\right) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} a_{32} - a_{23} \\ a_{13} - a_{31} \\ a_{21} - a_{12} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2}$$

The attitude of a rigid body can also be represented as a rotation of angle $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ around a unit vector axis $u \in \mathbb{S}^2$. This is commonly known as the angle-axis parametrization of $SO(3)$ and is given by the map $\mathcal{R}_a : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^2 \to SO(3)$ such that

$$\mathcal{R}_a(\theta, u) = I + \sin(\theta)[u]_\times + (1 - \cos\theta)[u]_\times^2.$$

2.2 Exp-synergistic potential functions on SO(3)

Given a finite index set $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{N}$, we let $\mathcal{C}^0\left(SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q}, \mathbb{R}^+\right)$ denote the set of positive-valued and continuous functions $\mathcal{U} : SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q} \to \mathbb{R}^+$. If, for each $q \in \mathcal{Q}$, the map $R \mapsto \mathcal{U}(R, q)$ is differentiable on the set $D_q \subseteq SO(3)$ then the function $\mathcal{U}(R, q)$ is continuously differentiable on $\mathcal{D} \subseteq SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q}$, where $\mathcal{D} = \cup_{q\in\mathcal{Q}} D_q \times \{q\}$, in which case we denote $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}^1\left(\mathcal{D}, \mathbb{R}^+\right)$. Additionally, for all $(R, q) \in \mathcal{D}$, $\nabla\mathcal{U}(R, q) \in T_R SO(3)$ denotes the gradient of $\mathcal{U}$, with respect to R, relative to the Riemannian metric (1).A function $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}^0\left(SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q}, \mathbb{R}^+\right)$ is said to be a potential function on $\mathcal{D} \subseteq SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q}$ with respect to the set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ if:

- $\mathcal{U}(R, q) > 0$ for all $(R, q) \notin \mathcal{A}$,
- $\mathcal{U}(R, q) = 0$, for all $(R, q) \in \mathcal{A}$,
- $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathcal{D}, \mathbb{R}^+)$.

The set of all potential functions on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $\mathcal{A}$ is denoted as $\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$, where a function $\mathcal{U}(R, q) \in \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ can be seen as a family of potential functions on $SO(3)$ encoded into a single function indexed by q.

Definition 1 *For a given finite index set $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \subset SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q}$, let $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$. The potential function $\mathcal{U}$ is said to be exp-synergistic if and only if there exist constants $\delta, \underline{\alpha}, \overline{\alpha} > 0$ such that*

$$\bar{\delta} := \min_{(R,q)\in\bar{\mathcal{D}}} \Big(\mathcal{U}(R, q) - \min_{m\in\mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{U}(R, m)\Big) > \delta, \tag{3}$$

$$\underline{\alpha}\, \mathcal{U}(R, q) \leq \|\nabla\mathcal{U}(R, q)\|_F^2 \leq \bar{\alpha}\, \mathcal{U}(R, q), \quad (R, q) \in \mathcal{D}, \tag{4}$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{D}} := (SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q}) \setminus \mathcal{D}$ defines the set of all singular points where $\mathcal{U}$ is not differentiable. The scalar $\bar{\delta}$ is referred to as the synergistic gap of $\mathcal{U}$.

Condition (3) implies that at any given singular point $(R, q) \in \bar{\mathcal{D}}$ there exists another point $(R, m) \in SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\mathcal{U}(R, m)$ has a lower value than $\mathcal{U}(R, q)$. This condition is similar to the synergism property defined in Mayhew and Teel (2011c) for potential functions $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}^1(SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q}, \mathbb{R}^+)$. Condition (4), as will become clear later, plays an important role to ensure desirable exponential decay when using a gradient-based feedback. This condition essentially means that $\mathcal{U}$ is quadratic with respect to its gradient, and also implies that $\nabla\mathcal{U}(R, q)$ does not vanish at any point other than the elements of $\mathcal{A}$.

2.3 Hybrid systems framework

In this work, we make use of the recent framework for dynamical hybrid systems found in Goebel and Teel (2006); Goebel et al. (2009). A subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq0} \times \mathbb{N}$ is a hybrid time domain if it is a union of finitely or infinitely many intervals of the form $[t_j, t_{j+1}] \times \{j\}$ with $0 = t_0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq ...$, and the last interval being possibly of the form $[t_j, t_{j+1}] \times \{j\}$ or $[t_j, \infty) \times \{j\}$. Let $\rightrightarrows$ denote a set-valued mapping. A general model of a hybrid system $\mathcal{H}$ takes the form:

$$\mathcal{H} \begin{cases} \dot{x} \in F(x), & x \in C \\ x^+ \in G(x), & x \in D \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

where the *flow map*, $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$ governs continuous flow of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the *flow set* $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ dictates where the continuous flow could occur. The *jump map*, $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$, governs discrete jumps of the state x, and the *jump set* $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ defines where the discrete jumps are permitted. Note that the state $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ could possibly include both continuous and discrete components. A *hybrid arc* is a function $x : \text{dom}\, x \to \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\text{dom}\, x$ is

a hybrid time domain and, for each fixed j, $t \mapsto x(t,j)$ is a locally absolutely continuous function on the interval $I_j = \{t : (t,j) \in \text{dom } x\}$. The reader is referred to Goebel et al. (2012) and Teel et al. (2013) for more details, and in particular, for the definitions of global asymptotic/exponential stability in hybrid systems.

2.4 Models and problem statement

Consider the following system on $SO(3)$

$$\dot{R} = R[u_1]_\times, \tag{6}$$

where $R \in SO(3)$ represents the attitude state and $u_1 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the control input. The stabilization control problem for system (6) consists in designing appropriate input u_1 such that $(R = I)$ is globally exponentially stable. We also consider the previous system augmented by the angular velocity dynamics

$$\dot{R} = R[\omega]_\times, \qquad \dot{\omega} = u_2, \tag{7}$$

where $R \in SO(3)$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^3$ represent the state variables and $u_2 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the control input. The objective is to design an appropriate input u_2 such that $(R = I, \omega = 0)$ is globally exponentially stable. It is important to mention that various attitude control/estimation problems for rigid body systems can be formulated as the stabilization problems of system (6) or (7). To illustrate this, we present in Section 4 solutions to the attitude estimation and attitude tracking problems leading to global and exponential stability results. We also address some practical problems related to the implementation of the derived hybrid algorithms. In fact, we propose a smoothing mechanism that removes the switching effects from the actual control input through an integrator. We also show that the derived control and estimation algorithms can be implemented using (explicitly) the available sensor outputs (*i.e.,* inertial vector measurements).

3 Main results

In this section, we propose global exponential hybrid attitude control schemes on $SO(3)$ for both system models described in Section 2.4. For the sake of clarity, we present our main results in two parts. First, we propose an approach for the design of hybrid control algorithms using a switching dynamical system based on the gradient of generic potential functions on $SO(3)$. Basically, we show that global exponential stability of the closed loop equilibrium point can be guaranteed with a particular choice of potential functions satisfying some sufficient conditions. We also show that the same results are guaranteed using continuous control laws that are obtained via a dynamic extension of the originally derived hybrid controllers. Second, we provide a systematic methodology for the construction of such potential functions on $SO(3)$, and derive the expression of the control algorithms accordingly. Next, we show that the proposed control algorithms can be expressed explicitly in terms of measurements of some known vectors.

3.1 Global exponential feedback control on $SO(3)$

In this subsection, we present a hybrid design of the control inputs u_1 and u_2 in (6) and (7), respectively, providing global exponential stability results. Inspired by Mayhew and Teel (2011b), these control inputs are based on a hybrid mechanism that uses a "min-switch" strategy to select the control law derived from the minimal potential function among some family of potential functions on $SO(3)$. Let $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a finite index set and $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_1)$ be a potential function on $\mathcal{D} \subset SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q}$ with respect to

$$\mathcal{A}_1 := \{(R,q) \in SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q} \mid \ R = I\}. \tag{8}$$

For a given $\delta > 0$, the switching mechanism of the discrete state variable q, which dictates the current *mode* of operation of the hybrid control system, is given by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{q} = 0, & (R,q) \in C, \\ q^+ \in G(R), & (R,q) \in D, \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

where the flow set C and jump set D are defined by

$$C = \{(R,q) : \mathcal{U}(R,q) - \min_{m \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{U}(R,m) \leq \delta\}, \tag{10}$$

$$D = \{(R,q) : \mathcal{U}(R,q) - \min_{m \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{U}(R,m) \geq \delta\}, \tag{11}$$

and $G(R) = \big\{q \in \mathcal{Q} : \ \mathcal{U}(R,q) = \min_{m \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{U}(R,m)\big\}$. Our results in this subsection are given in Theorem 1, Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 proved in Appendix A, Appendix B and Appendix C, respectively.

Theorem 1 *Consider system* (6) *with the control input*

$$u_1 = -k_c x_R(R,q), \quad k_c > 0, \tag{12}$$

with $x_R(R,q) := \psi\left(R^\top \nabla \mathcal{U}(R,q)\right)$*, where* q *is generated by* (9)-(11) *and the map* $\psi(\cdot)$ *is defined in* (2)*. If the potential function* $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_1)$ *used in* (9)-(12) *is exp-synergistic with synergistic gap exceeding* δ*, then the input* u_1 *in* (12) *is well-defined on the flow set* C*, and the set* $\mathcal{A}_1$ *is globally exponentially stable.*

Theorem 2 *Consider system* (7) *with the control input*

$$u_2 = -k_c x_R(R,q) - k_\omega \omega, \quad k_c, \ k_\omega > 0, \tag{13}$$

where $x_R(R,q)$ *is defined as in Theorem 1. If the potential function* $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_1)$ *used in* (9)-(11) *and* (13) *is exp-synergistic with synergistic gap exceeding* δ*, then the input* u_2 *in* (13) *is well-defined on the flow set* C*, and the set* $\mathcal{A}_2 = \{(R,q,\omega) \in SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \ R = I, \ \omega = 0\}$ *is globally exponentially stable.*

Note that the proposed attitude control schemes are subject to discontinuous jumps due to the direct switching

in the hybrid controller configuration. However, the result of Theorem 2 can be used to design a continuous control input for (6), which is generally more desirable in practice. In fact, letting the input u_1 in (6) be given by the output of the dynamic system

$$\dot{u}_1 = -k_\omega u_1 - k_c x_R(R,q), \quad u_1(0) = u_{1,0}, \tag{14}$$

guarantees, by Theorem 2, global exponential stability of the set $\mathcal{A}_{1,s} = \{(R,q,u_1) \in SO(3)\times\mathcal{Q}\times\mathbb{R}^3 \mid R = I,\ u_1 = 0\}$. Using this observation, the attitude control scheme in Theorem 2 can be modified, by introducing a simple dynamic system, to ensure the same global exponential stability result using continuous control for system (7). This is shown in the following result proved in Appendix C.

Theorem 3 *Consider system* (7) *with the control input*

$$\begin{aligned} u_2 &= -k_c x_{R,s} - k_\omega \omega, \\ \dot{x}_{R,s} &= -k_s(x_{R,s} - x_R(R,q)), \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

for some $x_{R,s}(0)$, where $k_c, k_\omega, k_s > 0$ and $x_R(R,q)$ is defined as in Theorem 1. If the potential function $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_1)$ used in (9)-(11) *and* (15) *is exp-synergistic with synergistic gap exceeding δ, then $x_R(R,q)$ in* (15) *is well-defined on the flow set C. Moreover, there exists a positive constant $\underline{k}_s$ such that if $k_s > \underline{k}_s > 0$ then the set $\mathcal{A}_{2,s} := \{(R,q,\omega,\tilde{x}_R) \in SO(3)\times\mathcal{Q}\times\mathbb{R}^3\times\mathbb{R}^3 : \quad R = I,\ \omega = 0,\ \tilde{x}_R = 0\}$ is globally exponentially stable, where $\tilde{x}_R = x_{R,s} - x_R(R,q)$.*

Remark 1 *The control scheme in Theorem 3 shows that the hybrid controller* (13) *can be made continuous without sacrificing global exponential results. This does not contradict the conclusions in Bhat and Bernstein (2000) since the continuous control scheme* (15) *is in fact time-varying due to the integral action on the hybrid term $x_R(R,q)$ which moves the discontinuity one integrator away from the control input. The same remark can be noted on the control input* (14).

The results in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 (Theorem 3) provide a unified method for the design of hybrid (continuous) attitude control algorithms for systems (6) and (7), respectively, guaranteeing global exponential stability results. To the best of our knowledge, there is no control algorithm in the literature that ensures similar results for systems (6) and (7) in the general terms presented above. It is worth pointing out that, in addition to the structurally simple expressions of the controllers proposed so far, the results in this subsection reduce the stabilisation problem of systems (6) and (7), to the problem of finding appropriate *exp*-synergistic potential functions, in the sense of Definition 1, with some synergistic gap that can be specified using the control parameters.

3.2 Construction of an exp-synergistic potential function on $SO(3)$

In this subsection, we present a method to construct a potential function $\mathcal{U}$ on $SO(3)\times\mathcal{Q}$ that is *exp*-synergistic, satisfying hence the conditions of our results above. Before we proceed, we recall an important class of functions used in the gradient-based attitude control systems on $SO(3)$, which is written in the general form

$$\Phi_A(R) = \frac{1}{2\gamma_A}\mathrm{tr}(A(I-R)), \tag{16}$$

where $\gamma_A \triangleq \mathrm{tr}(A) - \lambda^A_{\min}$ such that the matrix $\mathrm{tr}(A)I - A$ is symmetric positive definite. It has been shown in Mayhew and Teel (2011c); Casau et al. (2014); Berkane and Tayebi (2015) that function (16) can be used, with some transformation $\Gamma(R,q)$, to construct a central synergistic family of potential functions given by $\Phi_A \circ \Gamma(R,q)$, where the property of synergism here is understood in the sense of Definition 1 in Berkane and Tayebi (2015). The transformation $\Gamma(R,q)$ is mainly introduced to move the undesired critical points of Φ_A to different locations (depending on $q \in \mathcal{Q}$) while leaving the identity element a fixed point for all $q \in \mathcal{Q}$. This guarantees global asymptotic stability results. Unfortunately, it is difficult to show that the gradient of $\Phi_A \circ \Gamma(R,q)$, using any transformation, satisfies a similar property in (4).

In this work, we consider the following function on $SO(3)$

$$V(R) = 1 - \sqrt{1 - \Phi_I(R)}, \tag{17}$$

where Φ_I is defined as in (16) with $A = I$ and $\gamma_I = 2$. Note that V in (17) is not differentiable on the set $D_V = \{R \in SO(3) \mid \Phi_I(R) = 1\} \subset SO(3)$ and is quadratic with respect to its gradient (Lee, 2012). This makes it a good candidate for the construction of *exp*-synergistic potential functions on $SO(3)$ as shown in the following Proposition 1 proved in Appendix D.

Proposition 1 *Let $\mathcal{Q} = \{1,2,...,6\}$ be a finite index set. Consider the transformation $\Gamma : SO(3)\times\mathcal{Q} \to SO(3)$ defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} &\Gamma(R,q) = R\mathcal{R}_a(\phi_q(R), \nu(q)), \\ &\phi_q(R) = 2\arcsin\left(\varrho(q)\Phi_I(R)\right), \\ &\nu(q) = u_{\sigma(q)}, \quad \varrho(q) = (-1)^q k, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where $\sigma(q) = q \bmod 3 + 1$, for some scalar $k < 1/\sqrt{5}$ and orthonormal set of vectors $\{u_1,u_2,u_3\}$. Then, $V \circ \Gamma \in \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_1)$, where V and Γ are defined, respectively, in (17) *and* (18), *$\mathcal{D} = \{(R,q) \in SO(3)\times\mathcal{Q} \mid \Phi_I(\Gamma(R,q)) \neq 1\}$, and $\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ is defined in* (8). *Moreover the potential function $V \circ \Gamma$ is exp-synergistic with a gap $\bar{\delta}$ satisfying $\bar{\delta} \geq \frac{-1+\sqrt{1+4k^2}}{2\sqrt{3}k}$.*

Remark 2 *In Proposition 1, the transformation* $\Gamma(R,q)$ *can be seen as a perturbation to* R *about the unit vector* $\nu(q)$ *by an angle* $\phi_q(R)$*. This allows to stretch/compress the manifold* $SO(3)$ *in order to move the singular points of* $V(R)$ *to different locations on* $SO(3)$*. Note that the transformation* $\Gamma(R,q)$ *in Proposition 1 is different from the one proposed in Berkane and Tayebi (2015) in the sense that* (18) *is specifically designed, taking into account* (17)*, to ensure the requirements of Definition 1. Consequently, the choice of the set* $\mathcal{Q}$ *in Proposition 1 leads to hybrid controllers* (9)-(15) *with six possible modes. This choice is due to the nature of the singular manifold* $\bar{D}_V \equiv \mathcal{R}_a(\pi, \mathbb{S}^2)$ *which corresponds to the set of all rotations of angle* π *around any vector in* $\mathbb{S}^2$*. Roughly speaking, to avoid this singular manifold one needs to apply angular warping in at least three different directions, where in each direction the warping angle could be positive or negative. This will be clear following the proof of the proposition.*

Now, consider the potential function $\mathcal{U}(R,q) := V \circ \Gamma(R,q)$ where $V(R)$ and $\Gamma(R,q)$ are defined in (17)-(18). Noting that $\nabla \mathcal{U}(R,q) = \frac{\nabla(\Phi_I \circ \Gamma(R,q))}{2\sqrt{1-\Phi_I(R)}}$, and using (2), (17)-(18), and the result of Lemma 1 in Appendix D, the expression of the proportional-like term $x_R(R,q)$, used in (12)-(15), can be derived as

$$x_R(R,q) = \frac{1}{8}\Theta_q^\top(R)\frac{\psi(\Gamma(R,q))}{\sqrt{1-\Phi_I(\Gamma(R,q))}}, \tag{19}$$

with

$$\Theta_q(R) = \mathcal{R}_a(\phi_q(R), \nu(q))^\top + \frac{\varrho(q)\nu(q)\psi(R)^\top}{\sqrt{1-\varrho^2(q)\Phi_I^2(R)}}, \tag{20}$$

and the maps ϕ_q, ν and ϱ being defined in (18). Therefore, the following result holds.

Theorem 4 *Consider system* (6) *(respectively* (7)*) with the control input* (12) *or* (14) *(respectively* (13)*) where* $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ *is generated by* (9)-(11)*, with* $\mathcal{Q}$ *and the potential function* $\mathcal{U}(R,q) := V \circ \Gamma(R,q)$ *given in Proposition 1, and the term* $x_R(R,q)$ *is given by* (19)-(20)*. Pick the scalar* δ *in* (9)-(11) *such that* $\delta < \frac{-1+\sqrt{1+4k^2}}{2\sqrt{3}k}$ *where* k *is given in Proposition 1. Then, the set* $\mathcal{A}_1$ *or* $\mathcal{A}_{1,s}$ *(respectively* $\mathcal{A}_2$*) is globally exponentially stable. In addition, in the case of system* (7) *with the control input* (15)*, there exists a gain* $k_s > \underline{k}_s > 0$ *such that* $A_{2,s}$ *is globally exponentially stable. The lower bound* $\underline{k}_s$ *is computed in Appendix F.*

The proof of Theorem 4 follows by showing, from Proposition 1, that the family of potential functions $\mathcal{U}(R,q) := V \circ \Gamma(R,q)$ satisfy all the conditions of Theorems 1-3. The results also show that the term $x_R(R,q)$ in (12), (13) and (15) is well defined in the flow set. In fact, since $\varrho^2(q)\Phi_I^2(R) \leq k^2 < 1/5$, the quantity in (20) is well defined. Also, using the fact that $\Phi_I(\Gamma(R,q)) \neq 1$, for all $(R,q) \in \mathcal{D}$, it follows that (19) is well defined on C since $C \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ by virtue of the definition of the set C and the fact that $\mathcal{U}(R,q)$ is *exp*-synergistic (see Appendix A for more details).

3.3 Vector measurements formulation of the proposed controllers

The control algorithms proposed in Theorem 4 depends explicitly on the full measurement of the attitude $R \in SO(3)$. However, in practice, there is no sensor that measures directly an attitude matrix. Instead, we consider a set of n-vectors $\{h_i\}_{1\leq i\leq n}$ available for measurement such that $h_i = R^\top r_i$ where $\{r_i\}_{1\leq i\leq n}$ is a set of n constant known vectors. The aim of this subsection is to reformulate the control systems discussed previously explicitly in terms of the measured vectors h_i. This avoids the computational overhead of reconstructing the attitude and is particularly suited for implementation on embedded hardware platforms. This issue is solved in the following result proved in Appendix E.

Proposition 5 *Consider the* n*-vectors* $h_i = R^\top r_i$*,* $i = 1,\dots,n$*, with* $R \in SO(3)$*, and suppose that at least two vectors* r_i *are non-collinear. Consider also the positive semi-definite matrix* $M := \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i r_i r_i^\top$*, for* $\rho_i > 0$*,* $i = 1,\dots,n$*, with its unit eigenvectors* v_i*,* $i = 1,2,3$*, such that* $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ *is an orthonormal basis. Define the new vectors*

$$y_j = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{ij} h_i & j = 1,2 \\ y_1 \times y_2 & j = 3 \end{cases}, \tag{21}$$

where $\alpha_{ij} = (\rho_i/\lambda_j^M)(r_i^\top v_j)$*, for* $i = 1,\dots,n$*,* $j = 1,2,3$*, and* λ_1^M *and* λ_2^M *are two non-zero eigenvalues of* M *corresponding, respectively and without loss of generality, to* v_1 *and* v_2*. Then, the following relations hold:*

$$\Phi_I(R) = \tfrac{1}{8}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^3 \|y_j - v_j\|^2, \tag{22}$$

$$\psi(R) = \tfrac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^3 [y_j]_\times v_j, \tag{23}$$

$$\Phi_I\left(\Gamma(R,q)\right) = \tfrac{1}{8}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^3 \|y_j - \bar{v}_j(q)\|^2, \tag{24}$$

$$\psi\left(\Gamma(R,q)\right) = \tfrac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_a^\top(\phi_q(R), \nu(q))\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^3 [y_j]_\times \bar{v}_j(q), \tag{25}$$

where $\psi(R)$*,* $\Phi_I(R)$ *are defined in* (2) *and* (16)*, respectively,* $\Gamma(R,q)$*,* $\nu(q)$*, are given in* (18)*, and* $\bar{v}_j(q) := \mathcal{R}_a(\phi_q(R), \nu(q))v_j$*,* $j = 1,2,3$*, with* $\phi_q(R)$ *being obtained from* (18) *using* (22)*.*

The result in Proposition 5 shows that the expression of $x_R(R,q)$ in Theorem 4 can be explicitly written in terms of some vectors h_i, $i = 1,\dots,n$, satisfying $h_i = R^\top r_i$.

4 Application Examples

In this section, we use the above obtained results to derive solutions to the attitude estimation and the attitude tracking control problems on $SO(3)$ that achieve global exponential stability results. Let $R_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}} \in SO(3)$ denote the orientation of a body-attached frame $\mathcal{B}$ relative to the inertial reference frame $\mathcal{I}$, and satisfy

$$\dot{R}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}} = R_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}}[\Omega]_\times, \tag{26}$$

where $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the angular velocity of the body-frame $\mathcal{B}$ with respect to $\mathcal{I}$ expressed in $\mathcal{B}$. Suppose also that a set of $n \geq 2$ vectors, denoted by b_i, can be measured in $\mathcal{B}$ and are associated to a set of n known inertial vectors, denoted by r_i, such that

$$b_i = (R_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}})^\top r_i. \tag{27}$$

Such measurements can be obtained, for instance, via an Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) that typically includes at least an accelerometer and a magnetometer providing, respectively, an estimate of the gravitational field and Earth's magnetic filed expressed in $\mathcal{B}$.

4.1 Global exponential attitude estimation on SO(3)

Our objective in this subsection is to design a globally exponentially stable attitude estimation scheme using the available measurements b_i and assuming that the angular velocity Ω is available for feedback. Let $\hat{R}$ denote an estimate of $R_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}}$ obtained according to the following algorithm

$$\dot{\hat{R}} = \hat{R}[\Omega]_\times - [u_o]_\times \hat{R}, \tag{28}$$

with some initial conditions and $u_o \in \mathbb{R}^3$ being an additional input to be designed. Note that the structure (28) has been considered, for instance, in Mahony et al. (2008) where the input u_o has been designed to achieve *almost* global asymptotic stability results. Based on our results in Section 3, we propose in the following a different design for this input that guarantees global exponential convergence of $\hat{R}$ to $R_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}}$. Define the attitude estimation error $\tilde{R}_o = R_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}} \hat{R}^\top$. Using (26)-(28), one can show that $\dot{\tilde{R}}_o = \tilde{R}_o[u_o]_\times$, which is equivalent to (6). Consequently, the following corollary of Theorem 4 holds.

Corollary 1 *Consider system* (26) *with* (28). *Let* $q_o \in \mathcal{Q}$ *be generated by* (9)-(11) *with the potential function* $\mathcal{U}(\tilde{R}_o, q_o) := V \circ \Gamma(\tilde{R}_o, q_o)$, *where* $\mathcal{Q}$, $V(\tilde{R}_o)$, $\Gamma(\tilde{R}_o, q_o)$ *are defined as in Proposition 1, and* $\delta > 0$ *is selected as in Theorem 4. Also, let* $u_o = -k_o x_R(\tilde{R}_o, q_o)$, *where* $k_o > 0$ *and* $x_R(\tilde{R}_o, q_o)$ *is given by* (19)-(20). *Then, the set* $\mathcal{A}_o := \{(\tilde{R}_o, q_o) \in SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q} \mid \tilde{R}_o = I\}$ *is globally exponentially stable.*

Note that the expression of $x_R(\tilde{R}_o, q_o)$, in view of (9)-(11) and (17)-(20), depends on $\tilde{R}_o := R_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}} \hat{R}^\top$. Therefore, the attitude observer obtained in Corollary 1 can be implemented along with an appropriate reconstruction algorithm for $R_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}}$ using the inertial vector measurements b_i Shuster and Oh (1979). However, it is desirable, from a practical point of view, to reformulate the observer directly in terms of the measured vectors b_i. For this aim, we let $h_i = \hat{R} b_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and, in view of (27), satisfy $h_i = \tilde{R}_o^\top r_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. As a consequence of Proposition 5 and Corollary 1, the observer correction term can be obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
u_o &= -\frac{k_o}{16} \frac{\Theta^\top \sum_{j=1}^3 [y_j]_\times \bar{v}_j(q_o),}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{8}\sum_{j=1}^3 \|y_j - \bar{v}_j(q_o)\|^2}}, \\
\Theta &= I - 4\varrho(q_o) \frac{\sum_{j=1}^3 \nu(q_o) v_j^\top [y_j]_\times}{\sqrt{64 - \varrho^2(q_o)\left(\sum_{j=1}^3 \|y_j - v_j\|^2\right)^2}}, \\
\bar{v}_j(q_o) &= \mathcal{R}_a\left(2\sin^{-1}\left(\tfrac{\varrho(q_o)}{8}\sum_{j=1}^3 \|y_j - v_j\|^2\right), \nu(q_o)\right) v_j,
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where v_j, y_j, $\bar{v}_j(q_o)$ are defined as in Proposition 5, with $h_i = \hat{R} b_i$, the maps ν and ϱ are defined in (18), and the index variable q_o is generated by the hybrid dynamics (9)-(11) with the potential function $\mathcal{U}(\tilde{R}_o, q_o)$ is given explicitly by

$$\mathcal{U}(\tilde{R}_o, q_o) = 1 - \sqrt{1 - \tfrac{1}{8}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^3 \|y_j - \bar{v}_j(q_o)\|^2}. \tag{30}$$

4.2 Global exponential attitude tracking on SO(3)

Consider the attitude dynamics of a rigid body

$$\dot{R}_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}} = R_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}}[\Omega]_\times, \qquad J\dot{\Omega} = [J\Omega] \times \Omega + \tau, \tag{31}$$

where $R_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}} \in SO(3)$ represents the orientation of the rigid body relative to $\mathcal{I}$, $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the angular velocity of the rigid body, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the input torque, and $J \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$ is the positive-definite inertia matrix of the rigid body with respect to $\mathcal{B}$. Our objective in this subsection is to design a feedback control law τ such that $R_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}} \to R_d$ exponentially for arbitrary initial conditions, where $R_d(t) \in SO(3)$ is a desired attitude satisfying $\dot{R}_d = R_d[\Omega_d]_\times$, for some $R_d(0) \in SO(3)$ and a desired angular velocity $\Omega_d(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

Let $\tilde{R}_c := R_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}} R_d^\top$ and $\tilde{\omega}_c := R_d(\Omega - \Omega_d)$ denote, respectively, the attitude tracking error and the angular velocity tracking error. Also, consider the torque input in (31)

$$\tau = -[J\Omega]_\times \Omega + J\big(\dot{\Omega}_d - [\Omega_d]_\times \Omega + R_d^\top u_c\big), \tag{32}$$

where u_c is an additional input to be designed. Using (31), with (32) and the property $R^\top [x]_\times R = [R^\top x]_\times$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $R \in SO(3)$, one can verify that

$$\dot{\tilde{R}}_c = \tilde{R}_c [\tilde{\omega}_c]_\times, \qquad \dot{\tilde{\omega}}_c = u_c, \tag{33}$$

which is similar to (7). Therefore, the following result follows immediately from Theorem 4.

Corollary 2 *Consider system* (31) *with* (32). *Let* $q_c \in \mathcal{Q}$ *be generated by* (9)-(11) *with the potential function* $\mathcal{U}(\tilde{R}_c, q_c) := V \circ \Gamma(\tilde{R}_c, q_c)$, *where* $\mathcal{Q}$, $V(\tilde{R}_c)$, $\Gamma(\tilde{R}_c, q_c)$ *are defined as in Proposition 1, and* $\delta > 0$ *is selected as in Theorem 4. Also, let* u_c *in* (32) *be given as* $u_c = -k_c x_R(\tilde{R}_c, q_c) - k_\omega \tilde{\omega}_c$, *where* $k_c,\ k_\omega > 0$ *and* $x_R(\tilde{R}_c, q_c)$ *is given by* (19)-(20). *Then, the set* $\mathcal{A}_c := \{(\tilde{R}_c, q_c, \tilde{\omega}_c \in SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \tilde{R}_c = I, \tilde{\omega}_c = 0\}$ *is globally exponentially stable. If, instead, the continuous control input*

$$\begin{aligned} u_c &= -k_c x_{R,s} - k_\omega \tilde{\omega}_c, \\ \dot{x}_{R,s} &= -k_s (x_{R,s} - x_R(\tilde{R}_c, q_c)), \end{aligned}$$

is used, then there exists a gain $k_s > \underline{k}_s > 0$ *such that the set* $\mathcal{A}_{c,s} := \{(\tilde{R}_c, q_c, \tilde{\omega}_c, \tilde{x}_R) \in SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q} \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \tilde{R}_c = I, \tilde{\omega}_c = 0, \tilde{x}_R = 0\}$, *with* $\tilde{x}_R = x_{R,s} - x_R(\tilde{R}_c, q_c)$, *is globally exponentially stable.*

The proposed attitude tracking controllers in Corollary 2 can be implemented assuming that Ω and $R_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}}$ are available for feedback. If, instead of $R_{\mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{I}}$, only inertial vector measurements are available as in (27), then the expression of $x_R(\tilde{R}_c, q_c)$ in Corollary 2 can be derived using the available measurements by letting $h_i = R_d b_i = \tilde{R}_c^\top r_i$ in Proposition 5, as done in (29). In summary, we propose the following continuous torque input

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= -[J\Omega]_\times \Omega + J\big(\dot{\Omega}_d - [\Omega_d]_\times \Omega + R_d^\top u_c\big), \\ u_c &= -k_c x_{R,s} - k_\omega R_d (\Omega - \Omega_d), \\ \dot{x}_{R,s} &= -k_s x_{R,s} + \frac{k_s}{16} \frac{\Theta^\top \sum_{j=1}^3 [y_j]_\times \bar{v}_j(q_c)}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{8}\sum_{j=1}^3 \|y_j - \bar{v}_j(q_c)\|^2}}, \\ \Theta &= I - 4\varrho(q_c) \frac{\sum_{j=1}^3 \nu(q_c) v_j^\top [y_j]_\times}{\sqrt{64 - \varrho^2(q_c)\left(\sum_{j=1}^3 \|y_j - v_j\|^2\right)^2}}, \\ \bar{v}_j(q_c) &= \mathcal{R}_a\left(2\sin^{-1}\left(\tfrac{\varrho(q_c)}{8}\sum_{j=1}^3 \|y_j - v_j\|^2\right), \nu(q_c)\right) v_j, \end{aligned}$$

where v_j, y_j, $\bar{v}_j(q_c)$ are defined as in Proposition 5, with $h_i = R_d b_i$, the maps ν and ϱ are defined in (18) and the index variable q_c is generated by the hybrid dynamics (9)-(11) with the potential function $\mathcal{U}(\tilde{R}, q_c)$ having a similar expression to (30);

$$\mathcal{U}(\tilde{R}, q_c) = 1 - \sqrt{1 - \tfrac{1}{8}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^3 \|y_j - \bar{v}_j(q_c)\|^2}.$$

Remark 3 *It is well known that inertial vector measurements* (27) *can be corrupted with noise and therefore incorporating these measurements directly in the torque input may deteriorate the performance of the attitude tracking controller. To solve this issue, a common practice is to implement a complementary filter or an attitude estimator that filters the measured attitude information and gives a considerably less noisy estimates of the attitude of the rigid body. Then, the tracking control law is designed using the estimated states assuming that a separation principle holds. The global exponential results in this section suggest that such a separation principle can be shown when combining the estimation and control algorithms in Corollary 1 and Corollary 2.*

5 Conclusion

We designed globally exponentially stabilizing hybrid feedback schemes for the first and second order attitude dynamics. In addition, we showed that it is possible to remove jumps from the control input by adding a simple first order linear filter without jeopardizing the global exponential stability results.

The newly proposed hybrid feedback design relies on a new concept of *exp*-synergistic non-differentiable potential functions on $SO(3)$ enjoying the property of being quadratic with respect to their gradients and being synergistic with respect to the gradients singular points. An explicit construction of such a family of potential function as well as a lower bound on the synergistic gap are provided.

Furthermore, the proposed hybrid scheme is explicitly written in terms of an arbitrary number of vector measurements and applied to the attitude estimation and attitude tracking problems on SO(3) leading to global exponential stability; a result that was considered as the *holy grail* for many years.

A Proof of Theorem 1

Let $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_1)$, where $\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{D} \subset SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q}$, be an *exp*-synergistic potential function with gap $\bar{\delta} > \delta$. From (3), we have $\mathcal{U}(R,q) - \min_{m \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{U}(R,m) > \delta$, for all $(R,q) \in \bar{\mathcal{D}}$. Therefore, one can deduce from (10) that $C \cap \bar{\mathcal{D}} = \emptyset$, or equivalently, $C \cap \mathcal{D} = C$. It follows that $C \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ which implies that $\mathcal{U}$ is differentiable on the set C, and hence the input $x_R(R,q)$ in (12) is well defined on C. The closed loop system (6) with (12) along the flow set C is written as

$$\dot{R} = -k_c R\left[\psi(R^\top \nabla \mathcal{U}(R,q))\right]_\times = -k_c \nabla \mathcal{U}(R,q). \tag{A.1}$$

Then, for all $(R,q) \in C$, the time derivative of $\mathcal{U}$ along (A.1) is obtained as $\dot{\mathcal{U}}(R,q) = \langle \nabla \mathcal{U}, \dot{R} \rangle_R \leq -k_c \underline{\alpha}\, \mathcal{U}(R,q)$, where we used (1) and (4) with (A.1) to obtain the last inequality. Moreover, for all $(R,q) \in D$ and $g \in G(R)$, one has

$$\mathcal{U}(R,g) = \min_{m \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathcal{U}(R,m) \leq \mathcal{U}(R,q) - \delta \leq (1 - \delta/\bar{\mathcal{U}})\, \mathcal{U}(R,q),$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{U}} := \mathcal{U}(R(0,0), q(0,0))$ is the initial value of $\mathcal{U}$ which, since $\mathcal{U}$ is decreasing, represents the maximum of $\mathcal{U}(R,q)$ along the trajectories of (A.1). Consequently, we can apply the comparison principle (Cai and Teel, 2009, Lemma C.1) to conclude that, for all $(t,j) \in \text{dom}\,(R,q)$,

$$\mathcal{U}(R(t,j), q(t,j)) \leq \exp\left(-\lambda(t+j)\right)\mathcal{U}(R(0,0), q(0,0)),$$

where $\lambda = \min\{2k_c\underline{\alpha}, -\ln(1-\delta/\bar{\mathcal{U}}\} > 0$. Finally, since $\mathcal{U}$ is positive definite with respect to $\mathcal{A}_1$, one can conclude that the set $\mathcal{A}_1$ is globally exponentially stable.

B Proof of Theorem 2

Let $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_1)$ be an *exp*-synergistic potential function with gap $\bar{\delta} > \delta$ and where $\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{D} \subset SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q}$. Using similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1, we can show that the input $x_R(R,q)$ in (13) is well defined on C. Also, the closed loop system (7) with (13) along C is given by

$$\dot{R} = R[\omega]_\times, \qquad \dot{\omega} = -k_\omega \omega - k_c x_R(R,q), \tag{B.1}$$

which is an autonomous system. Since $\mathcal{U}$ satisfies (4), one can verify that

$$\frac{1}{2}\underline{\alpha}\,\mathcal{U}(R,q) \leq \|x_R(R,q)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\overline{\alpha}\,\mathcal{U}(R,q), \tag{B.2}$$

using the equality $\|\psi(R^T\xi)\|^2 = \frac{1}{2}\|\xi\|_F^2$, for all $\xi \in T_R SO(3)$. Moreover, the potential function $\mathcal{U}(R,q)$ is naturally bounded on $SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q}$ since any continuous real-valued function is bounded on a compact manifold. This implies that there exists B_x such that $\|x_R(R,q)\|^2 \leq (\bar{\alpha}/2)\mathcal{U}(R,q) \leq B_x^2$. The angular velocity ω obeys dynamics of a first order linear filter with $x_R(R,q)$ as an input. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\omega(t,j)\| &\leq \|\omega_0\| e^{-k_\omega t} + \frac{k_c}{k_\omega} \sup_{(t,j)\in\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{N}} \|x_R(R,q)\| \\ &\leq B_\omega := \|\omega_0\| + \frac{k_c}{k_\omega} B_x.\end{aligned}$$

To show exponential stability, we consider the following Lyapunov function candidate

$$\mathcal{W}(R,q,\omega) = \frac{k_c}{2}\mathcal{U}(R,q) + \frac{1}{2}\|\omega\|^2 + c\,\omega^\top x_R(R,q), \tag{B.3}$$

for some positive constant c. In view of (B.2), one has $\frac{1}{2}z_1^\top M_1 z_1 \leq \mathcal{W} \leq \frac{1}{2}z_1^\top M_2 z_1$, where $z_1 = \left[\sqrt{\mathcal{U}(R,q)},\ \|\omega\|\right]^\top$, and

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} k_c & -c\sqrt{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2}} \\ -c\sqrt{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2}} & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \qquad M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} k_c & c\sqrt{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2}} \\ c\sqrt{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2}} & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For all $(R,q) \in C$, the time derivative of $\mathcal{W}$ along (B.1) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathcal{W}} =& k_c x_R(R,q)^\top \omega + \omega^\top(-k_\omega\omega - k_c x_R(R,q)) \\ &+ c\omega^\top \dot{x}_R + c x_R^\top(-k_\omega\omega - k_c x_R) \\ \leq& -ck_c\|x_R\|^2 - k_\omega\|\omega\|^2 + cD_x\|\omega\|\|x_R\| + ck_\omega\|x_R\|\|\omega\|,\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\dot{x}_R(R,q) = X(R,q)\omega$ with

$$X(R,q) = 2\left(\psi(R^T\nabla x_{R_1}), \psi(R^T\nabla x_{R_2}), \psi(R^T\nabla x_{R_3})\right)^\top$$

for $x_R = [x_{R_1}, x_{R_2}, x_{R_3}]^\top$. Also, since $SO(3)$ is a compact manifold, we know that there exists $D_x > 0$ such that $\|X(R,q)\|_F \leq D_x$ (see Appendix F for an example). As a result, one can deduce that

$$\dot{\mathcal{W}} \leq -\frac{1}{2}z_1^\top \begin{bmatrix} ck_c\underline{\alpha} & -ck_\omega\sqrt{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2}} \\ -ck_\omega\sqrt{\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{2}} & 2(k_\omega - cD_x) \end{bmatrix} z_1 = -\frac{1}{2}z_1^\top M_3 z_1.$$

It can be verified that matrices M_1, M_2 and M_3 are positive definite for

$$c < \min\left\{2\sqrt{k_c/\overline{\alpha}}, \frac{4k_c k_\omega \underline{\alpha}}{4D_x k_c \underline{\alpha} + k_\omega^2 \bar{\alpha}}\right\},$$

and therefore, one has $\dot{\mathcal{W}} \leq -\lambda_C \mathcal{W}$, for all $(R,q) \in C$, where $\lambda_C = \frac{\lambda_{\min}(M_3)}{\lambda_{\max}(M_2)}$. Moreover, for all $(R,q) \in D$ and $g \in G(R)$, if the constant c is chosen sufficiently small such that $c < \frac{k_c\delta}{8B_\omega B_x}$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}(R,g,\omega) - \mathcal{W}(R,q,\omega) =& \frac{k_c}{2}\big(\mathcal{U}(R,g) - \mathcal{U}(R,q)\big) \\ &+ c\omega^\top\big(x_R(R,g) - x_R(R,q)\big) \\ \leq& -\frac{k_c}{2}\delta + 2cB_\omega B_x < -\frac{k_c}{4}\delta.\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\mathcal{W}$ is strictly decreasing over the jump set D. Also, since all signals are bounded, it follows that there exists $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ such that $\mathcal{W}(R,q,\omega) \leq \bar{\mathcal{W}}$. Note also that for all $(R,q) \in D$, one has $\mathcal{U}(R,q) \geq \delta$ and therefore $\mathcal{W}(R,q,\omega,\tilde{x}_R) \geq k_c\delta/2$. This implies that $\mathcal{W}(R,g,\omega) \leq \exp(-\lambda_D)\mathcal{W}(R,q,\omega)$ where $\lambda_D = -\ln\left(1 - \frac{k_c\delta}{4\bar{\mathcal{W}}}\right)$. Consequently, one can apply the comparison principle [Lemma C.1, Cai and Teel (2009)] to conclude that, for all $(t,j) \in \text{dom}\,X$,

$$\mathcal{W}(X(t,j)) \leq \exp(-\lambda(t+j))\mathcal{W}(X(0,0)),$$

where $\lambda = \min\{\lambda_C, \lambda_D\}$. This shows, according to Teel et al. (2013), that the set $\mathcal{A}_2$ is globally exponentially stable.

C Proof of Theorem 3

Let $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{A}_1)$ be an *exp*-synergistic potential function with gap $\bar{\delta} > \delta$ and where $\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{D} \subset SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q}$. Using similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1, one can show that the input $x_R(R,q)$ in (13) is well defined on C. Also, the closed loop system (7) with (13) along C is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{R} &= R[\omega]_\times, \\ \dot{\omega} &= -k_c x_{R,s} - k_\omega \omega, \\ \dot{x}_{R,s} &= -k_s(x_{R,s} - x_R(R,q)), \end{aligned} \tag{C.1}$$

which is an autonomous system. The continuous variable $x_{R,s}$ obeys a dynamic of a first order linear systems with $x_R(R,q)$ seen as a bounded discontinuous input. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{R,s}(t,j)\| &\leq \|x_{R,s,0}\| e^{-k_s t} + \sup_{(t,j)\in\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{N}} \|x_R(R,q)\| \\ &\leq \|x_{R,s,0}\| + B_x, \end{aligned}$$

where B_x is a bound defined in the proof of Theorem 2. Since $\tilde{x}_R = x_{R,s} - x_R(R,q)$, one concludes that $\|\tilde{x}_R\| \leq B_{\tilde{x}} := \|x_{R,s,0}\| + 2B_x$. Using a similar argument as in the proof of Theorem 2, one can show that the angular velocity ω is bounded by some B_ω. Consider the following Lyapunov function candidate

$$\mathcal{W}_s = \frac{k_c}{2}\mathcal{U}(R,q) + \frac{1}{2}\|\omega\|^2 + c_1 x_R^\top \omega + \frac{c_2}{2}\|\tilde{x}_R\|^2,$$

where the constants c_1 and c_2 are chosen as follows

$$c_1 < \min\left\{2\sqrt{k_c/\bar{\alpha}},\ \frac{k_c k_\omega \underline{\alpha}}{k_\omega^2\bar{\alpha} + 2k_c D_x \underline{\alpha}},\ \frac{c_2 k_s k_c \underline{\alpha}}{k_c^2 \bar{\alpha}},\ \frac{k_c \delta}{16 B_x B_\omega}\right\}, \tag{C.2}$$

$$c_2 = \min\left\{\frac{k_c\delta}{8B_{\tilde{x}}^2}, \frac{\sqrt{k_c}}{D_x}\right\}. \tag{C.3}$$

It is clear that, since $c_1 < 2\sqrt{k_c/\bar{\alpha}}$, one has $\mathcal{W}_s$ is positive definite with respect to $\mathcal{A}_{2,s}$. For all $(R,q) \in C$, the time derivative of $\mathcal{W}_s$ along the trajectories (C.1) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathcal{W}}_s =& k_c x_R(R,q)^\top \omega + \omega^\top(-k_\omega\omega - k_c x_{R,s}) + c_1\omega^\top X(R,q)\omega \\ &+ c_1 x_R^\top(-k_\omega\omega - k_c x_{R,s}) + c_2\tilde{x}_R^\top(-k_s\tilde{x}_R - X(R,q)\omega) \\ \leq& -c_1 k_c\|x_R\|^2 - k_\omega\|\omega\|^2 - c_2 k_s\|\tilde{x}_R\|^2 + c_1 k_c\|x_R\|\|\tilde{x}_R\| \\ &+ (k_c + c_2 D_x)\|\omega\|\|\tilde{x}_R\| + c_1 k_\omega\|x_R\|\|\omega\| + c_1 D_x\|\omega\|^2 \\ \leq& -\frac{1}{2}z_1^\top P_1 z_1 - \frac{1}{2}z_2^\top P_2 z_2 - \frac{1}{2}z_3^\top P_3 z_3, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$P_1 = \begin{bmatrix} c_1 k_c\underline{\alpha}/2 & -c_1 k_\omega\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}/2} \\ -c_1 k_\omega\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}/2} & k_\omega - 2c_1 D_x \end{bmatrix},$$

$$P_2 = \begin{bmatrix} c_1 k_c\underline{\alpha}/2 & -c_1 k_c\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}/2} \\ -c_1 k_c\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}/2} & c_2 k_s \end{bmatrix},$$

$$P_3 = \begin{bmatrix} k_\omega & -(k_c + c_2 D_x) \\ -(k_c + c_2 D_x) & c_2 k_s \end{bmatrix},$$

and $z_1 = [\sqrt{\mathcal{U}(R,q)},\ \|\omega\|]^\top$, $z_2 = [\sqrt{\mathcal{U}(R,q)},\ \|\tilde{x}_R\|]^\top$ and $z_3 = [\|\omega\|,\ \|\tilde{x}_R\|]^\top$. In view of (C.2), the matrices P_1 and P_2 are positive definite. Moreover, the matrix P_3 is positive definite if

$$k_s > \underline{k}_s := \frac{(k_c + c_2 D_x)^2}{c_2 k_\omega}. \tag{C.4}$$

Note that the value $c_2 = \sqrt{k_c}/D_x$ minimizes the right hand side of (C.4) which motivates our choice of the constant c_2 in (C.3). In this case there exists λ_C such that $\dot{\mathcal{W}}_s \leq -\lambda_C \mathcal{W}_s$ for all $(R,q) \in C$. Between jumps, we have for all $g \in G(R)$ and $(R,q) \in D$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_s(R,g,\omega,\tilde{x}_R) - \mathcal{W}_s(R,q,\omega,\tilde{x}_R) \leq& -\frac{k_c\delta}{2} \\ &+ c_1 x_R^\top \omega \Big|_{(R,q)}^{(R,g)} + \frac{c_2}{2}\|\tilde{x}_R\|^2 \Big|_{(R,q)}^{(R,g)} \\ \leq& \frac{k_c\delta}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

where the facts that $c_1 x_R^\top \omega \Big|_{(R,q)}^{(R,g)} \leq 2c_1 B_x B_\omega$ and $\frac{c_2}{2}\|\tilde{x}_R\|^2 \Big|_{(R,q)}^{(R,g)} \leq c_2 B_{\tilde{x}}^2$ have been used along with (C.2) and (C.3). Hence, $\mathcal{W}_s$ is strictly decreasing over jumps. Since all signals are bounded, there exists $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ such that $\mathcal{W}_s(R,q,\omega,\tilde{x}_R) \leq \bar{\mathcal{W}}$. Note also that for all $(R,q) \in D$, one has $\mathcal{U}(R,q) \geq \delta$ and therefore $\mathcal{W}_s(R,q,\omega,\tilde{x}_R) \geq k_c\delta/2$. Hence one can write $\mathcal{W}_s(R,g,\omega,\tilde{x}_R) \leq \exp(-\lambda_D)\mathcal{W}_s(R,q,\omega,\tilde{x}_R)$ where $\lambda_D = -\ln\left(1 - k_c\delta/4\bar{\mathcal{W}}\right)$. Consequently, it follows that $\mathcal{A}_{2,s}$ is globally exponentially stable.

D Proof of Proposition 1

Before we proceed, we need the following technical result that can be deduced from Berkane and Tayebi (2015).

Lemma 1 *Consider the potential function $\Phi_A \in \mathcal{C}^1(SO(3),\mathbb{R}^+)$, defined in (16). For some index set $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $\nu : \mathcal{Q} \to \mathbb{S}^2$, let us consider the transformation $\Gamma : SO(3)\times\mathcal{Q} \to SO(3)$, defined as $\Gamma(R,q) = R\mathcal{R}_a(\phi_q(R),\nu(q))$, where $\phi_q(R) = 2\arcsin(k_q\Phi_A(R))$ for some scalar $k_q \in \mathbb{R}$. If the scalar gain k_q satisfies the*

bound $|k_q| < 1/\sqrt{1+4\xi}$, *where* $\xi = \frac{\mathrm{tr}(A)-\lambda^A_{\min}}{\mathrm{tr}(A)-\lambda^A_{\max}}$. *Then the following properties hold:*

- $\Gamma(R,q) = I$ *if and only if* $R = I$.
- $\det(\Theta_q(R)) \neq 0$, *for all* $R \in SO(3)$.
- *if* $V \in \mathcal{C}^1(D_V, \mathbb{R}^+)$, *for some* $D_V \subseteq SO(3)$, *then the function* $V \circ \Gamma \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathcal{D}, \mathbb{R}^+)$, *where* $\mathcal{D} = \{(R,q) \in SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q} \mid \Gamma(R,q) \in D_V\}$.

Furthermore,

$$\psi\left(R^\top \nabla(\Phi_A \circ \Gamma)(R,q)\right) = \Theta_q^\top(R)\psi\left(A\Gamma(R,q)\right)/2\gamma_A,$$

where $\Theta_q(R) = \mathcal{R}_a(\phi_q(R), \nu(q))^\top + \frac{2k_q\nu(q)\psi(AR)^\top}{\gamma_A\sqrt{1-k_q^2\Phi_A^2(R)}}$.

Let us show that the potential function $V \circ \Gamma$ is *exp*-synergistic. In view of (17) and Lemma 1, the potential function $V \circ \Gamma$ is not differentiable only on the set $\bar{\mathcal{D}} := \{(R,q) \in SO(3) \times \mathcal{Q} \mid \Phi_I(\Gamma(R,q)) = 1\}$. To compute the synergistic gap $\bar{\delta}$, given in Definition 1, we need first to evaluate the transformations $\Gamma(R,q)$ and $\Gamma(R,m)$, defined in (18), for some $q, m \in \mathcal{Q}$ on the set $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$. In the following, we use the quaternion representation [2] which helps to complete the proof of synergism. A unit quaternion $Q = (\eta, \epsilon) \in \mathbb{Q}$, consists of a scalar part η and three-dimensional vector ϵ, such that $\mathbb{Q} := \{Q = (\eta,\epsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid \eta^2 + \epsilon^\top\epsilon = 1\}$. The relation between the quaternion representation and the angle-axis representation is given by $\eta = \cos(\theta/2)$ and $\epsilon = \sin(\theta/2)\, u$. Therefore, a unit quaternion represents a rotation matrix through the map $\mathcal{R}_Q : \mathbb{Q} \to SO(3)$ defined as

$$\mathcal{R}_Q(Q) = I + 2[\epsilon]_\times^2 + 2\eta[\epsilon]_\times. \tag{D.1}$$

The set $\mathbb{Q}$ forms a group with the quaternion product, denoted by $\odot$, being the group operation and quaternion inverse defined by $Q^{-1} = (\eta, -\epsilon)$ as well as the identity-quaternion $Q_I = (1, 0_{3\times1})$, where $0_{3\times1} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is a column vector of zeros. Given $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathbb{Q}$ where $Q_1 = (\eta_1, \epsilon_1)$ and $Q_2 = (\eta_2, \epsilon_2)$ the quaternion product is defined by

$$Q_1 \odot Q_2 = \left(\eta_1\eta_2 - \epsilon_1^\top\epsilon_2, \eta_1\epsilon_2 + \eta_2\epsilon_1 + [\epsilon_1]_\times\epsilon_2\right), \tag{D.2}$$

and satisfying

$$\mathcal{R}_Q(Q_1)\mathcal{R}_Q(Q_2) = \mathcal{R}_Q(Q_1 \odot Q_2). \tag{D.3}$$

Let $Q = (\eta,\epsilon)$, $Q_q = (\eta_q, \epsilon_q)$ and $Q_p = (\eta_p, \epsilon_p)$ be the quaternion representation of the attitude R, $\Gamma(R,q)$ and $\Gamma(R,m)$, respectively. Let us define the set $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_Q = \left\{((\eta,\epsilon),q) \in \mathbb{Q} \times \mathcal{Q} \mid \eta_q = 0,\ \epsilon_q \in \mathbb{S}^2\right\}$. Note that, since $\mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{R}_Q(Q)) = 4\eta^2 - 1$ for some quaternion $Q = (\eta,\epsilon) \in \mathbb{Q}$, the set $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_Q$ represents a double cover of the set $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$. Making use of Rodrigues formula (D.1) in (16) and the fact that $\mathrm{tr}([\epsilon]_\times) = 0$ for all $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^3$, one can show that $\Phi_I(R) = 1 - \eta^2$, for all $R \in SO(3)$ such that $R = \mathcal{R}_Q(Q)$. Hence, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &V \circ \Gamma(R,m) = 1 - |\eta_p|, \\ &V \circ \Gamma(R,q) = 1, \quad \forall (R,q) \in \bar{\mathcal{D}}. \end{aligned} \tag{D.4}$$

Consequently, the synergistic gap of $V \circ \Gamma(R,q)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\delta} :&= \min_{(R,q)\in\bar{\mathcal{D}}} \left[V \circ \Gamma(R,q) - \min_{m\in\mathcal{Q}} V \circ \Gamma(R,m)\right] \\ &= \min_{(Q,q)\in\bar{\mathcal{D}}_Q} \max_{m\in\mathcal{Q}} |\eta_m|. \end{aligned} \tag{D.5}$$

It remains to evaluate $\max_{m\in\mathcal{Q}} |\eta_m|$ when $(Q,q) \in \bar{\mathcal{D}}_Q$. Making use of the quaternion product rule (D.2) and (D.3), and the fact that $\mathcal{R}_a(\phi_q, \nu(q))$ corresponds to the quaternion $(\cos(\phi_q/2), \sin(\phi_q/2)\nu(q))$, one can write

$$\begin{aligned} &\eta_q = \eta\cos(\phi_q/2) - \sin(\phi_q/2)\epsilon^\top\nu(q) = 0, \\ &\eta_m = \eta\cos(\phi_m/2) - \sin(\phi_m/2)\epsilon^\top\nu(m). \end{aligned} \tag{D.6}$$

Therefore, using the fact $\phi_m(R) = (-1)^{m+q}\phi_q(R)$, one has

$$\eta\cos(\phi_m/2) = \eta\cos(\phi_q/2) = \sin(\phi_q/2)\epsilon^\top\nu(q), \tag{D.7}$$

and thus, by direct substitution in (D.6), one obtains $\eta_m = \sin(\phi_q/2)\epsilon^\top\nu(q) - \sin(\phi_m/2)\epsilon^\top\nu(m)$. Moreover, in view of (18), one has $\sin(\phi_q(R)/2) = \varrho(q)\Phi_I(R) = \varrho(q)\|\epsilon\|^2$. This yields

$$\eta_m = \varrho(q)\|\epsilon\|^3\left[\cos(\vartheta(q)) + (-1)^{q+m+1}\cos(\vartheta(m))\right] \tag{D.8}$$

where the fact that $\nu(q)^\top\epsilon = \|\epsilon\|\cos(\vartheta(q))$, where $\vartheta(q) = \angle(\nu(q),\epsilon)$, has been used. On the other hand, in view of (18), one has $\sigma(q) = \sigma(q+3)$ which implies that $\vartheta(q) = \vartheta(q+3)$ for all $q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{\pm x_q(1), \pm x_q(2), \pm x_q(3)\}$ such that $x_q(m) = (-1)^{q+m+1}\cos(\vartheta(m))$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{m\in\mathcal{Q}} |\eta_m| &= k\|\epsilon\|^3 \max_{\bar{x}\in\mathcal{X}} |\cos(\vartheta(q)) + \bar{x}| \\ &= k\|\epsilon\|^3\left\{|\cos(\vartheta(q))| + \max_{\bar{x}\in\mathcal{X}} |\bar{x}|\right\} \\ &= k\|\epsilon\|^3\left\{|\cos(\vartheta(q))| + \max_{m\in\mathcal{Q}} |\cos(\vartheta(m))|\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the fact $\max_{y\in[-a,a]} |x+y| = |x| + \max_{y\in[-a,a]} |y|$, has been used to obtain the second equality. Also, since

[2] The reader is referred to Shuster (1993) for more details on unit-quaternion representation.

$\{\nu(1),\nu(2),\nu(3)\}$ is an orthonormal basis, one has

$$\sum_{m=1}^{3}\cos^2(\vartheta(m))=1\leq 3\max_{m\in\mathcal{Q}}|\cos(\vartheta(m))|^2,$$

and hence $\max_{m\in\mathcal{Q}}|\eta_m|\geq k\|\epsilon\|^3/\sqrt{3}$. Furthermore, for all $(Q,q)\in\bar{\mathcal{D}}_Q$, equation (D.7) can be rewritten as

$$\sqrt{1-\|\epsilon\|^2}\sqrt{1-\varrho(q)^2\|\epsilon\|^4}=|\varrho(q)|\|\epsilon\|^3|\cos(\vartheta(q))|,$$

where again the fact that $\sin(\phi_q(R)/2)=\varrho(q)\|\epsilon\|^2$ has been used. Using the fact $\varrho(q)=(-1)^q k$, the above equation reads $f(\|\epsilon\|^2)=0$ where $f(x):=g(x)+\sin^2(\vartheta(q))k^2x^3$, and $g(x):=1-x-k^2x^2$. It is easy to verify that $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are decreasing on the interval $[0,1]$ for all $\vartheta(q)\in\mathbb{R}$. Therefore, since $f(x)\geq g(x)$, the solution $x_f\in[0,1]$ to equation $f(x_f)=0$ is greater than or equals to $x_g\in[0,1]$, with $g(x_g)=0$. Thus, it is clear that $f(\|\epsilon\|^2)=0$ implies that

$$\|\epsilon\|^2\geq\frac{-1+\sqrt{1+4k^2}}{2k^2}.$$

Finally, one concludes that

$$\bar{\delta}=\min_{(Q,q)\in\bar{\mathcal{D}}_Q}\max_{m\in\mathcal{Q}}|\eta_m|\geq\frac{-1+\sqrt{1+4k^2}}{2\sqrt{3}k}.$$

Next, we show that the potential function $V\circ\Gamma$ satisfies (4) of Definition 1. By Lemma 1, since $|\varrho(q)|=k<1/\sqrt{5}$, one has $\det(\Theta_q(R))\neq 0$ for all $R\in SO(3)$. This implies that the matrix $\Theta_q(R)\Theta_q(R)^\top$ is full rank and positive definite for all $(R,q)\in SO(3)\times\mathcal{Q}$. Let us denote $\underline{\lambda}_\Theta(R,q),\bar{\lambda}_\Theta(R,q)>0$ the smallest, respectively greatest, eigenvalue of $\Theta_q(R)\Theta_q(R)^\top$. Define $\underline{\lambda}^*_\Theta\triangleq\min_{SO(3)\times\mathcal{Q}}\underline{\lambda}_\Theta(R,q)$ and $\bar{\lambda}^*_\Theta\triangleq\max_{SO(3)\times\mathcal{Q}}\bar{\lambda}_\Theta(R,q)$. Then, in view of (19)-(20), one has

$$\frac{\underline{\lambda}^*_\Theta}{64}\frac{\|\psi\circ\Gamma\|^2}{1-\Phi_I\circ\Gamma}\leq\|\psi\left(R^\top\nabla(V\circ\Gamma)\right)\|^2\leq\frac{\bar{\lambda}^*_\Theta}{64}\frac{\|\psi\circ\Gamma\|^2}{1-\Phi_I\circ\Gamma}.$$

Furthermore, it is straightforward[3] to verify that

$$\|\psi(X)\|^2=4\Phi_I(X)(1-\Phi_I(X)).\tag{D.9}$$

Also, using the fact that $\frac{1}{2}x\leq 1-\sqrt{1-x}\leq x$, for all $x\in[0,1]$, it follows that

$$\frac{\underline{\lambda}^*_\Theta}{32}V\circ\Gamma\leq\|\psi\left(R^\top\nabla(V\circ\Gamma)\right)\|^2\leq\frac{\bar{\lambda}^*_\Theta}{16}V\circ\Gamma.$$

[3] Let $Q_X=(\eta_X,\epsilon_X)\in\mathbb{Q}$ such that $X=\mathcal{R}_Q(Q_X)$. Using the definition of ψ and (D.1) yields $\psi(X)=2\eta_X\epsilon_X$ which implies that $\|\psi(X)\|^2=4\eta_X^2\|\epsilon_X\|^2$. Since $\Phi_I(X)=\|\epsilon_X\|^2$, identity (D.9) follows.

Finally, using the fact that $\|\psi(Y)\|^2=\frac{1}{2}\|RY\|_F^2$, for all $Y\in\mathfrak{so}(3)$, one concludes that the potential function $V\circ\Gamma$ satisfies condition (4) with $\underline{\alpha}=\underline{\lambda}^*_\Theta/2$ and $\bar{\alpha}=\bar{\lambda}^*_\Theta$.

E Proof of Proposition 5

First, note that M is a real symmetric matrix, and therefore, its unit eigenvectors v_i, $i=1,2,3$, can be selected such that $\{v_1,v_2,v_3\}$ is an orthonormal basis. Also, it can be verified that $\text{rank}(M)\geq 2$ provided that at least two inertial vectors r_i are non-collinear Tayebi et al. (2013). This implies that at least two eigenvalues of M are non-zero. These two non-zero eigenvalues of M are denoted by λ_1^M and λ_2^M without loss of generality. Also, one can verify that $Mv_j=\sum_{i=1}^n\rho_i r_i(r_i^\top v_j)=R\sum_{i=1}^n\rho_i h_i(r_i^\top v_j)$ for $j=1,2,3$. This with the relations $Mv_j=\lambda_j^M v_j$, $j=1,2,3$, lead one to deduce that the vectors y_j in (21) satisfy $y_j\triangleq R^\top v_j$ for $j=1,2,3$. Exploiting this last relation, and making use of the identity $u^\top Au=\text{tr}(uu^\top A)$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^3\|y_j-P^\top v_j\|^2&=\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^3 v_j^\top(I-PR^\top)(I-RP^\top)v_j\\&=2\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^3\text{tr}(v_jv_j^\top(I-RP^\top))\\&=8\Phi_I\left(RP^\top\right),\end{aligned}\tag{E.1}$$

for any matrix $P\in SO(3)$, where we used the fact that $\sum_{j=1}^3 v_jv_j^\top=I$. Consequently, equality (22) is obtained by letting $P=I$. Also, using (18) with (22), one can deduce (24) by letting $P=\mathcal{R}_\theta^\top(\phi_q(R),\nu(q))$. Furthermore, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_a(RP^\top)&=\frac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^3\left[RP^\top-PR^\top\right]\\&=\frac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^3 P\left[P^\top v_jv_j^\top R-R^\top v_jv_j^\top P\right]P^\top,\\&=\frac{1}{2}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^3\left[P(y_j\times P^\top v_j)\right]_\times,\end{aligned}\tag{E.2}$$

where we used the relations $PP^\top=I$ and $R[yx^\top-xy^\top]R^\top=R[x\times y]_\times R^\top=[R(x\times y)]_\times$ (Shuster, 1993). Taking the vex operator on both sides of equation (E.2) and letting $P=I$, respectively $P=\mathcal{R}_\theta^\top(\phi_q(R),\nu(q))$, yields (23), respectively (25).

F Lower bound on k_s

Recall from the proof of Theorem 3, equation (C.4), that a lower bound of k_s is given by $\underline{k}_s=(k_c+c_2D_x)^2/c_2k_\omega$, where $c_2=\min\left\{k_c\delta/8B_{\tilde{x}}^2,\sqrt{k_c}/D_x\right\}$ and $B_{\tilde{x}}=\|x_{R,s,0}\|+2B_x$. Thus, one needs to evaluate the constants B_x and D_x upper bounds of $x_R(R,q)$ and $X(R,q)$, respectively, where $\dot{x}_R(R,q)=X(R,q)\omega$. First, let us define the functions $\kappa_1,\kappa_2:SO(3)\to\mathbb{R}^3$

$$\kappa_1(R)=\frac{\psi(R)}{\sqrt{1-\Phi_I(R)}},\quad\kappa_2(R)=\frac{(-1)^q k\psi(R)}{\sqrt{1-k^2\Phi_I^2(R)}},$$

where $k < 1/\sqrt{5}$ and $q \in \mathcal{Q}$. In view of (D.9), one has $\|\kappa_1(R)\| = 2\sqrt{\Phi_I(R)} \leq 2$. Also, since $k < 1/\sqrt{5}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\|\kappa_2(R)\| &= 2\sqrt{k^2\Phi_I(R)(1-\Phi_I(R))/(1-k^2\Phi_I^2(R))} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{(1-\Phi_I(R))/(5-\Phi_I^2(R))} \leq 2/\sqrt{5} < 1,\end{aligned}$$

where the fact that $\Phi_I(R) \leq 1$ has been used. Now, in view of (20), one has $\Theta_q(R) = \mathcal{R}_a(\phi_q(R), \nu(q))^\top + \nu(q)\kappa_2(R)^\top$ which gives

$$\operatorname{tr}\left(\Theta_q(R)^\top \Theta_q(R)\right) = 3 + 2\kappa_2(R)^\top \nu(q) + \|\kappa_2(R)\|^2 < 6.$$

It follows that $\|x_R(R,q)\| \leq \|\Theta_q(R)\|_F \|\kappa_1(\Gamma(R,q)\|/8 < \sqrt{6}/4$. Consequently, $B_{\tilde{x}} = \|x_{R,s,0}\| + 2B_x = \|x_{R,s,0}\| + \sqrt{6}/2$. To find the expression of $X(R,q)$, one needs the following derivations along the trajectories of $\dot{R} = R[\omega]_\times$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{R}_a(\phi_q(R),\nu(q)) &= \mathcal{R}_a(\phi_q(R),\nu(q))[\nu(q)]_\times \kappa_2(R)^\top \omega, \\ \frac{d}{dt}\kappa_2(R) &= E_2(R)\omega, \\ \frac{d}{dt}\Theta_q(R)^\top &= \mathcal{R}_a(\phi_q(R),\nu(q))[\nu(q)]_\times \kappa_2(R)^\top \omega + \\ &\qquad E_2(R)\omega\nu(q)^\top, \\ \frac{d}{dt}\Gamma(R,q) &= \Gamma(R,q)\left[\Theta_q(R)\omega\right]_\times, \\ \frac{d}{dt}\kappa_1(\Gamma(R,q)) &= E_1(\Gamma(R,q))\Theta_q(R)\omega,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}E_1(R) &= \frac{\left[W(R) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa_1(R)\kappa_1(R)^\top\right]}{2\sqrt{1-\Phi_I(R)}}, \\ E_2(R) &= \frac{(-1)^q k\left[W(R) + \Phi_I(R)\kappa_2(R)\kappa_2(R)^\top\right]}{2\sqrt{1-k^2\Phi_I^2(R)}}, \\ W(R) &= \operatorname{tr}(R)I - R^\top.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, using the product rule and the above derivations, the time derivative of the vector $x_R(R,q)$ defined in (19) is given by $\dot{x}_R(R,q) = X(R,q)\omega$ where

$$\begin{aligned}X(R,q) = \frac{1}{8}\Big[&\mathcal{R}_a(\phi_q(R),\nu(q))[\nu(q)]_\times \kappa_1(\Gamma(R,q))\kappa_2(R)^\top + \\ &E_2(R)\nu(q)^\top \kappa_1(\Gamma(R,q)) + \Theta_q(R)^\top E_1(\Gamma(R,q))\Theta_q(R)\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{tr}\left(W(R)^\top W(R)\right) &= \operatorname{tr}\left((1+\operatorname{tr}^2(R))I - \operatorname{tr}(R)(R+R^\top)\right) \\ &= 3 + \operatorname{tr}^2(R) \leq 12,\end{aligned}$$

where the fact that $\operatorname{tr}(R) \leq 3$ for all $R \in SO(3)$ to obtain the last equality. Also, using the fact that $\psi(R)R = \psi(R)$ for all $R \in SO(3)$, one can write

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{tr}(E_1^\top E_1) &= \frac{\operatorname{tr}\left[W^\top W + \frac{1}{4}\|\kappa_1\|^2\kappa_1\kappa_1^\top + (\operatorname{tr}(R)-1)\kappa_1\kappa_1^\top\right]}{4(1-\Phi_I)} \\ &= \frac{\left[3 + \operatorname{tr}^2(R) + 4\Phi_I^2 + 4(\operatorname{tr}(R)-1)\Phi_I\right]}{4(1-\Phi_I)} \\ &= \frac{\operatorname{tr}(R)+9}{4} \leq 3.\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\|W(R)\|_F \leq 2\sqrt{3}$ and $\|E_1(R)\|_F \leq \sqrt{3}$, for all $R \in SO(3)$. Also, using Caushy-Schwartz inequality and the fact that $\|uu^\top\|_F = \|u\|^2$, one obtains $\|E_2(R)\|_F < (2\sqrt{3}+1)/4$. Therefore, an upper bound on $\|X(R,q)\|_F$ is given by

$$\|X(R,q)\|_F \leq D_x = \frac{3}{16} + \frac{7}{8}\sqrt{3}.$$

The obtained bounds $B_{\tilde{x}}$ and D_x allows to compute the lower bound of k_s in (C.4).

References

Berkane, S. and Tayebi, A. (2015). On the design of synergistic potential functions on $SO(3)$. *Accepted to the 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control. An online version is available at arXiv:1502.07386v2 [math.OC].*

Bhat, S. P. and Bernstein, D. S. (2000). A topological obstruction to continuous global stabilization of rotational motion and the unwinding phenomenon. *Systems & Control Letters*, 39:63–70.

Bullo, F. (2005). *Geometric control of mechanical systems*, volume 49. Springer Science & Business Media.

Cai, C. and Teel, A. R. (2009). Characterizations of input-to-state stability for hybrid systems. *Systems & Control Letters*, 58(1):47–53.

Casau, P., Mayhew, C. G., Sanfelice, R. G., and Silvestre, C. (2015). Global exponential stabilization on the n-dimensional sphere. In *American Control Conference*, pages 3218–3223. IEEE.

Casau, P., Sanfelice, R. G., Cunha, R., and Silvestre, C. (2014). A globally asymptotically stabilizing trajectory tracking controller for fully actuated rigid bodies using landmark-based information. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*.

Chaturvedi, N., Sanyal, A., and McClamroch, N. (2011). Rigid-body attitude control. *Control Systems, IEEE*, 31(3):30 – 51.

Goebel, R., Sanfelice, R. G., and Teel, A. R. (2009). Hybrid dynamical systems. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 29(2):28–93.

Goebel, R., Sanfelice, R. G., and Teel, A. R. (2012). *Hybrid Dynamical Systems: modeling, stability, and robustness*. Princeton University Press.

Goebel, R. and Teel, A. (2006). Solutions to hybrid inclusions via set and graphical convergence with stability theory applications. *Automatica*, 42:573–587.

Hughes, P. (1986). *Spacecraft attitude dynamics*. John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Itô, K. (1993). *Encyclopedic dictionary of mathematics*, volume 1. MIT press.

Joshi, S., Kelkar, A., and Wen, J.-Y. (1995). Robust attitude stabilization of spacecraft using nonlinear quaternion feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 40(10):1800–1803.

Koditschek, D. E. (1988). Application of a new Lyapunov function to global adaptive attitude tracking. In *Proceedlngs of the 27th Conference on Decision and Control, Austin, Texas*.

Kreutz, K. and Wen, J. T. (1988). Attitude control of an object commonly held by multiple robot arms: A lyapunov approach. In *American Control Conference, 1988*, pages 1790–1794. IEEE.

Lee, T. (2012). Exponential stability of an attitude tracking control system on $SO(3)$ for large-angle rotational maneuvers. *Systems & Control Letters*, 61(1):231–237.

Lee, T. (2015). Global exponential attitude tracking controls on so(3). *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, PP(99):1–1.

Mahony, R., Hamel, T., and Pflimlin, J.-M. (2008). Nonlinear complementary filters on the special orthogonal group. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 53(5):1203–1218.

Maithripala, D. S., Berg, J. M., and Dayawansa, W. P. (2006). Almost-global tracking of simple mechanical systems on a general class of Lie groups. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 51(2):216–225.

Mayhew, C. G. (2010). *Hybrid Control for Topologically Constrained Systems*. PhD thesis, UC Santa Barbara.

Mayhew, C. G. and Teel, A. (2011a). On the topological structure of attraction basins for differential inclusions. *Systems & Control Letters*, 60(12):1045–1050.

Mayhew, C. G. and Teel, A. (2013a). Synergistic hybrid feedback for global rigid-body attitude tracking on $SO(3)$. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(11):2730–2742.

Mayhew, C. G. and Teel, A. R. (2011b). Hybrid control of rigid-body attitude with synergistic potential functions. In *American Control Conference*, pages 287–292.

Mayhew, C. G. and Teel, A. R. (2011c). Synergistic potential functions for hybrid control of rigid-body attitude. In *American Control Conference*, pages 875–880.

Mayhew, C. G. and Teel, A. R. (2013b). Global stabilization of spherical orientation by synergistic hybrid feedback with application to reduced-attitude tracking for rigid bodies. *Automatica*, 49(7):1945–1957.

Morse, M. (1934). *The calculus of variations in the large*, volume 18. American Mathematical Soc.

Sakagami, N., Shibata, M., Kawamura, S., Inoue, T., Onishi, H., and Murakami, S. (2010). An attitude control system for underwater vehicle-manipulator systems. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 1761–1767.

Shuster, M. (1993). A survey of attitude representations. *The Journal of the Astronautical Sciences*, 41(4):439–517.

Shuster, M. D. and Oh, S. D. (1979). Three-axis attitude determination from vector observations. *Journal of Guidance and Control*, 4:70–77.

Tayebi, A. and McGilvray, S. (2006). Attitude stabilization of a vtol quadrotor aircraft. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology.*, 14(3):562–571.

Tayebi, A., Roberts, A., and Benallegue, A. (2013). Inertial vector measurements based velocity-free attitude stabilization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(11).

Teel, A., Forni, F., and Zaccarian, L. (2013). Lyapunov-based sufficient conditions for exponential stability in hybrid systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(6):1591–1596.

Thienel, J. and Sanner, R. (2003). A coupled nonlinear spacecraft attitude controller and observer with an unknown constant gyro bias and gyro noise. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 48(11):2011–2015.